



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/802,131

03/15/2004

Dale A. Herigstad

AVE-001CNRCE2

3388

959 7590 12/17/2009

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000  
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

PARKER, BRANDON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/17/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/802,131	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HERIGSTAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BRANDON PARKER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15,26-28,33-45,50,53,59-66,71-82,84-93,95,98-109,111 and 112 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15,26-28,33-45,50,53,59-66,71-82,84-93,95,98-109,111 and 112 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/30/2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 37, 59, 82, 86 and 109 have been amended and claims 1-15, 26-28, 33-45, 50, 53, 59-66, 71-82, 84-93, 95, 98-109, 111 and 112 are remain pending for examination.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 26-28, 33-45, 50, 53, 59-66, 71-82, 84-93, 95, 98-109, 111 and 112 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 1-15, 19, 20, 26-28, 33-35, 37-38, 40-45, 50, 53, 59-60, 62-66, 67, 71-82, 84, 86, 87, 89-93, 95, 98-109, and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicks et al (US Patent No. 5,796,394 hereinafter Wicks) in view of Clifton-Bligh et al (US Patent 6775659 hereinafter Clifton-Bligh).

With respect to claim 1,

- Wicks provides teachings of a mobile telephone apparatus (i.e. electronic apparatus), said mobile telephone apparatus (i.e. electronic apparatus) comprising (mobile telephone, Wicks Claim 1)
- a display surface for displaying information in a visually partitioned manner, said visually partitioned information being presented on said display in at least two regions; (300 Fig. 4 Drawing) a keypad containing keys, each of said keys corresponding to at most a single region of said display wherein each region is associated with at least one of the keys in the keypad (twelve key keypad, Wicks Claim 4, Claim 5), and represents a choice of an option that may be selected by selecting the associated key (i.e. pressed key) logic for triggering an event in response to a selection of the associated key; and a processor for executing the logic for triggering the event (“determining with the processor, the image from the plurality of images that correspond to the pressed key”, Wicks Claim 13) said event triggered by the selection of the associated key (“accepting from the keypad a signal indicating a key was pressed”, Claim 13). Wicks discloses a rule for processing received information for the first user (Claim 7) wherein wherein the rule specifies how information is to be routed conditioned upon the sender of

the information. Furthermore, it is understood depressing the key on the keypad corresponding to the bin number and position. Bins are filled with icons that indicate a voice-mail, e-mail, fax or other message has been received for the user. Selection of a bin brings the user to successive screen displays and options for accessing the messages so the selections execute an action/event (i.e. trigger an event in response to an associated key) wherein 9 bins are arranged on the display screen in the format of the keys labeled 0-9 on a twelve key keypad (Col. 2 lines 48-59). Wicks does not explicitly disclose the triggering of the event resulting in the display of additional information, the additional information having been retrieved from a remotely located web server, the additional information partitioned and presented on the display in at least two regions, each of the regions displaying additional information with at least one of the keys in the keypad.

- Clifton-Bligh discloses a mobile telephone which a user presses the a key on the keypad which corresponds which access Web functions from the main menu (Fig. 11a) wherein the user presses 9 to connect to the Web homepage (Fig. 11b) then the uses presses the 1 key on the keypad to navigate information on the first link from the current webpage and a user has the option to select a key on the keypad which corresponds to the display which accesses webpage information, maintaining an up-to-date map of the pages in a particular site, or those stored one or more than one server (Col. 33 lines 35-67, Col. 34 lines 33-67, Fig. 11a-e, Col. 15 lines 35-43)

Art Unit: 2174

- It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the keypad which corresponds to an array of web pages as taught by Clifton-Bligh with the keypad/display bin of Wicks to effectively access remote web server information through a corresponding keypad which reflects the displayed information.

Claims 37, 59, 82, 86, and 109 are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 2,

- Wicks shows that a display (Fig. 4 Drawing) is organized in a configuration (i.e. arrangement) that corresponds to a configuration of the keys on the keypad ("displaying user areas and numerals on the display screen in an arrangement that corresponds with the keys on the keypad", Wicks Claim 5)

Claim 53, 63 and 90 are similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 3,

- Wicks shows that each region (i.e. bin) is associated with a service option for a service (Col. 7 lines 21-34) and selecting the selected key (i.e. pressing a key) results in a request for the service (Col. 5 lines 41-47) Note: a service can retrieve voice messages over the handheld device, can have electronic mail and faxes delivered to the user's computer, can have a fax printed out, can copy the information to other users, can place the information in a "low priority" stack, or perform other functions.

Art Unit: 2174

With respect to claim 4,

- Wicks shows that each region contains a graphical element (i.e. bins) that visually represents a choice (Fig. 4 Drawing, Col. 7 lines 21-26).
- Wicks shows that the regions contain text (1 David, Drawing Fig 4)

Claim 5, 6, 64, 65, 66, 91, 92, 93 are similar in scope to claim 5 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 7

- Wicks shows that new information (Fig. 5 Drawing) associated with the selected key on the keypad is displayed following said triggering of an event (Col. 8 lines 37-43).

Claim 72 and 99 are similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 8

- Wicks shows that new information (Fig. 5 Drawing) that is displayed on the display is visually partitioned into regions (buttons 322,326 Fig. 5 Drawing) that are each associated with respective ones of the keys on the keypad (Col 5 lines 5-10)

Claim 73 and 100 are similar in scope to claim 8 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 9

Art Unit: 2174

- Wicks shows that information is displayed on said display displays in at least five regions (322, 326 Fig 5 Drawing) Note: Wicks shows 6 regions (i.e. Buttons 1, 2, 3, \*, 0, #)

Claim 74 and 101 are similar in scope to claim 9 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 10

- Wicks shows that information is displayed on said display displays in nine regions associated with respective keys numbered one through nine (Col. 8 lines 53-57, Fig. 4, 5 Drawing). Note: that in Box Window overlays the previous bin display of Fig 4 wherein Fig. 4 displays nine regions with keys numbered one through nine.

Claim 40, 41, 75, 80, and 102 are similar in scope to claim 10 and the claims are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 11

- Wicks discloses a mobile telephone apparatus wherein each of the regions contains a border for visually delimiting the regions (Fig. 4 Drawing). Note: The borders are the oval containers that separate one bin (i.e. region) from the next bin (i.e. region).

Claim 76 and 103 are similar in scope to claim 11 and the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 12,



Art Unit: 2174

- Wicks shows where regions occupy substantially all of the display (300/Fig 4 Drawing)

Claim 77 and 104 are similar in scope to claim 12 and the claims are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 13

- Wicks shows each region is associated exclusively with a single one of the keys of a keypad (one image/region is displayed per key/region Wicks Claim 27)

Claim 78 and 105 are similar in scope to claim 13 and the claims are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 14

- Wicks does not explicitly disclose a keypad is a virtual keypad/touch screen but does disclose a palm (Col 3 lines 60-65)
- Clifton-Bligh discloses a touch-sensitive screen, a grid or other arrangement of keys (e.g. a mobile telephone), or any other device. (Col. 38 lines 1-3),
- It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the touch screen as taught by Clifton-Bligh with the mobile telephone of Wicks to effectively select an array of corresponding retrieved display information.

Claim 15, 42-45, 50, and 79 are similar in scope to claim 14 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 26

Art Unit: 2174

- Wicks shows an arrangement of said keys in a grid pattern, said grid pattern including at least four rows of at least 3 keys each and at least three columns (120 Fig. 1 Drawing).

With respect to claim 27

- Wicks shows a grid pattern includes keys bearing the numbers 1, 2 and 3 on separate consecutive keys from left to right in a first row, keys bearing the numbers 4, 5 and 6 on separate consecutive keys from left to right in a second row appearing below said first row, keys bearing the numbers 7, 8 and 9 on separate consecutive keys from left to right in a third row appearing below said second row, and a key bearing the number 0 appearing on a fourth row of keys on the center key, said fourth row appearing below said third row (“a standard twelve key telephone keypad” Wicks Claim 5, Col. 7 lines 59-62, Fig. 4 Drawing)  
Note: Wicks discloses where the correspondence between the keypad and the bins is reinforced by having the bins with the same labeling on the bins as on the keypad keys (Fig. 4 Drawing) arranged in the same layout as the keypad).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 27 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 33,

- Wicks shows that a keypad consist of two keys (a standard twelve key telephone keypad Wicks Claim 5)

Claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 33 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 35,

Art Unit: 2174

- Wicks shows regions are separate icons (i.e. bins 1-9) appearing on said display surface (300 Fig 4 Drawing).

Claim 38, 60, 84, 87, and 111 are similar in scope to claim 35 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 62

- Wicks discloses an electronic apparatus is a mobile phone (mobile telephone handset, Wicks Claim 1)

Claim 89 is similar in scope to claim 49 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 68,

- Wicks discloses an electronic apparatus is a PDA, (Col 3 lines 60-65).

Claims 81, 95, and 106-109 are similar in scope to claim 68 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to claim 71,

- Wicks discloses an electronic apparatus is an Internet appliance (PIC, PC Col. 3 lines 55 and 56).

Claim 98 is similar in scope to claim 71 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 36, 61, 85, 88, and 112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicks et al (US Patent No. 5,796,394 hereinafter Wicks) in view of

Art Unit: 2174

Clifton-Bligh et al (US Patent 6775659 hereinafter Clifton-Bligh) in further view of Scott (US Patent No. 5,543,818) (Scott hereinafter).

With respect to claim 36, in addition to claim 1, Wicks discloses a screen display, which have bins (i.e. regions) and selection boxes when selecting a bin (i.e. region) but fails to explicitly show a color difference or shade difference between regions on the portable electronic device and mobile telephone apparatus. However Scott discloses a cursor used to highlight (i.e. shading differences) quads (i.e. regions), (Col. 4 lines 4-41) and make visual selections (39,11 Fig. 2 Drawing).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide highlighted menu selections as taught by Scott with regions in a screen display of Clifton-Bligh/Wicks so users can efficiently make selections on a screen display.

Claims 61, 85, 88, and 112 are similar in scope and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON PARKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 730- 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon Parker  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2174

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174